



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/569,482	04/05/2006	Jun Takeuchi	2006_0117A	3416
513	7590	02/11/2009	EXAMINER	
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.			MCDOWELL, BRIAN E	
2033 K STREET N. W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021			1624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/11/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/569,482	TAKEUCHI, JUN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRIAN McDOWELL	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-14, 19-22 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/10/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

BM

DETAILED ACTION

RESPONSE TO ELECTION/RESTRICTION

Applicant's election without traverse of group I and election of specie (example 49 in specification) in the reply filed on 12/23/2008 is acknowledged.

Claims 15-18 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Applicant's elected specie was found free of the prior art and the full scope of the claims were examined.

This application contains claims drawn to an invention nonelected without traverse in the reply filed on 12/23/2008. A complete reply to this action must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

An action on the merits of claims 1-14 and 19-22 is contained herein.

Priority

This application claims the priority dates of 9/1/2003 and 10/29/2003, drawn to foreign applications 2003-309232 and 2003-369547. However, a certified English version of the foreign priority document was not received. Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit

of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), a certified English translation of the foreign application must be submitted in reply to this action

Failure to provide a certified translation may result in no benefit being accorded for the non-English application.

Thus, the effective filing date of this application is 8/31/2004.

Specification

The title of the disclosure is objected to because it is not descriptive of the invention. A more descriptive title would be the following: "Carboxylic Acid Derived Benzoxazines as Agents for the Treatment of Respiratory Diseases". Correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claims 12-14 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. **The “for use” limitations introduced into the claims do not further limit the subject matter in the claims where they occur and the claims should be deleted as duplicates or amended to further limit the pharmaceutical composition claims. Appropriate correction is required.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 (2nd Paragraph)

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1624

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3,5-9,11-14, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In the aforementioned claims applicant recites the limitation wherein R¹⁻² is a “an acidic group which may be protected”. The examiner currently can not define the metes and bounds of this phrase. What specific substituents are included by this limitation?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-14 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making solvates of the claimed compounds. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art of synthetic organic chemistry to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. "The factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as :

Art Unit: 1624

- a) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- b) the amount of direction or guidance presented,
- c) the presence or absence of working examples,
- d) the nature of the invention,
- e) the state of the prior art,
- f) the relative skill of those in that art,
- g) the predictability or unpredictability of the art,
- h) and the breadth of the claims",

In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. In the present case the important factors leading to a conclusion of undue experimentation are the absence of any working example of a formed solvate, the lack of predictability in the art, and the broad scope of the claims.

- a) The instant disclosure does not show how to make and/or use the claimed "solvates" of the present invention; thus one of ordinary skill would be forced to engage in undue experimentation to obtain solvates of the instant compounds.
- b) The specification does not provide procedural steps or parameters that would serve as direction or guidance concerning the preparation of "solvates".
- c) There is no working example of a "solvate" of the instantly claimed compound of formula (I-X). The absence of any examples, disclosures or guidance regarding the preparation of a single solvate of compounds selected from formula (I-X) is telling.
- d) The instant invention relates to benzoxazines of formula (I-X) (as well as solvates of said compounds) as agents for the treatment of respiratory diseases.

f) One would have a Ph. D. degree and several years of industrial experience.

e and g) The state of the art is that it is not predictable whether solvates will form or what their composition will be. In the language of the physical chemist, a solvate of organic molecule is an interstitial solid solution. This phrase is defined in the second paragraph on page 358 of West (Solid State Chemistry). West, Anthony R., "Solid State Chemistry and its Applications", Wiley, New York, 1988, pages 358 & 365. The solvent molecule is a species introduced into the crystal and no part of the organic host molecule is left out or replaced. In the first paragraph on page 365, West (Solid State Chemistry) says, "it is not usually possible to predict whether solid solutions will form, or if they do form what is their compositional extent". In this art, the examiner did not identify a single solvate of a benzoxazine compound of formula (I-X) for the treatment of respiratory diseases

Thus, in the absence of experimentation one cannot predict if a particular solvent will solvate any particular crystal. One cannot predict the stoichiometry of the formed solvate, i.e. if one, two, or a half a molecule of solvent added per molecule of host. In the same paragraph on page 365 West (Solid State Chemistry) explains that it is possible to make meta-stable non-equilibrium solvates, further clouding what Applicants mean by the word solvate. Compared with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom to solvates, which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stable region of the solvate.

h) The breadth of the claims includes all of the hundreds of thousands of compounds of formula (I-X) as well as the presently unknown list of solvents embraced by the term "solvate". Thus, the scope is broad.

Art Unit: 1624

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRIAN McDOWELL whose telephone number is (571)270-5755. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James O. Wilson can be reached 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BM

**/James O. Wilson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624**